

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to update the status of the parent application. Claims 75, 76, 83, 84, 88, 89, 95, 106 and 112 have been amended to improve form. Claims 72-112 remain pending in this application.

Claims 72-112 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saliba et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,710; hereinafter Saliba). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 72 recites a method for providing user support for a user accessing a web site. The method includes providing at least one web page to the user, where the at least one web page includes software associated with providing user support services. The method also includes receiving a request from the user, via the at least one web page, for support and identifying a user support party in response to the request.

The Office Action states that Saliba discloses receiving a request from a user, via at least one web page, for support and points to Fig. 5, item 522, col. 5, lines 25-30 and col. 17, lines 7-11 for support (Office Action – page 2). The Office Action also states that Saliba discloses identifying a user party in response to the request and points to Events D and E of Fig. 5 and col. 3, lines 52-61 for support (Office Action – page 2).

Initially, the applicants note that claim 72 recites “identifying a user support party in response to the request” (emphasis added). The Office Action merely states that Saliba discloses “identifying a user party in response to the request.” The applicants are unsure whether the Examiner intended to allege that Saliba discloses identifying a user support party, as recited in claim 72. Therefore, clarification as to the alleged teaching of Saliba

is respectfully requested in any subsequent communication. In any event, Saliba does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 72 as discussed in detail below.

For example, col. 5, lines 25-30 discloses that HTTP messages may be sent from client to server to request different types of server actions. Item 522 of Fig. 5 of Saliba illustrates an HTTP post message generated by browser 112 for transmission to web server 116. Message 522 includes function calling information, such as object, interface, method and arguments of the function call (Saliba – col. 13, 62-67). Saliba at col. 17, lines 7-11 discloses sending a request message that contains embedded function call information from a web browser to a web server. These portions of Saliba (which are alleged in the Office Action to disclose receiving a request from the user, via the at least one web page, for support) merely disclose that a user may transmit an HTTP message via web browser 112 to web server 116. These portions of Saliba do not disclose or suggest that the HTTP request is a request for support, as required by claim 72.

Event D of Fig. 5 of Saliba discloses that upon receiving the POST message, web server 116 loads the shopping server 136 and passes the WFCP-formatted function calling information to the shopping server 136 (col. 14, lines 4-7). Event E of Fig. 5 of Saliba discloses that shopping server 136 invokes the specified COM object 320A and passes the arguments to the specified method using the specified interface. Shopping server 136 thereby makes the function call on behalf of shopper 132. The function call may involve a query of and/or update to merchant databases 324. If an order capture method is called, the function call may update the merchant databases 324 to reflect the number of items being purchased by the consumer (col. 14, lines 8-18).

These portions of Saliba do not disclose identifying a user support party in response to the request, as recited in claim 72.

The other portion of Saliba relied upon as allegedly disclosing this feature (col. 3, lines 52-61) discloses that in an electronic shopping embodiment, the application specific client includes functionality similar to that of a shopping cart, wallet and an address book and the application specific server includes functionality for providing commerce related services, such as access/return product information, calculate tax, process order, etc. This portion of Saliba also does not disclose or suggest identifying a user support party in response to a request, as recited in claim 72.

For at least these reasons, Saliba does not disclose or suggest each of the features of claim 72. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 72 are respectfully requested.

Claims 73-79 are dependent on claim 72 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons claim 72 is allowable. In addition, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by Saliba.

For example, claim 74 recites that the sending the request for support to the identified user support party via a network comprises sending a uniform resource locator (URL) to the user support party, the URL representing the web page with which the request was made. The Office Action states that Saliba discloses this feature and points to col. 5, lines 11-36, col. 12, lines 59-61 and Fig. 8 for support (Office Action – page 3). The applicants respectfully disagree.

Saliba, as discussed above, does not disclose or suggest identifying a user support party in response to a request. Therefore, Saliba cannot disclose or suggest sending a

URL to the user support party, where the URL represents the web page with which the request was made.

Saliba at col. 5, lines 11-36 defines the terms URL, HTTP and HTTP post. Saliba at col. 12, lines 57-61 discloses that when the user selects the "Calculate Sales Tax" button, function calling information will be sent to a particular URL. Fig. 8 of Saliba illustrates HTML code used as part of a user interface for a shopper. None of these portions of Saliba discloses or suggests sending a URL to a user support party, where the URL represents the web page with which the request was made, as recited in claim 74.

For at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 74 are respectfully requested.

Claim 78 recites determining an identifier associated with the user, and wherein the identifying a user support party comprises identifying the user support party based on the identifier. Saliba, as discussed above, does not disclose or suggest identifying a user support party in response to a request. Therefore, Saliba cannot disclose or suggest determining an identifier associated with the user and the identifying a user support party comprises identifying the user support party based on the identifier, as recited in claim 78.

As to claim 78, the Office Action states that Saliba discloses "the customer identifier (e.g., see Name at col. 12, line 50)" (Office Action – page 3). Saliba at col. 12, line 50 discloses that the name of a product may be an argument of a function call. This portion of Saliba does not disclose determining an identifier associated with the user, and wherein the identifying a user support party comprises identifying the user support party based on the identifier, as recited in claim 78. In contrast, this portion of Saliba merely

discloses that the name of a product, such as “Socks”, may be included as an argument in a function call.

For at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 78 are respectfully requested.

Claims 80 and 111 recites features similar to claim 72. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 72, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 80 and 111 are respectfully requested.

Claims 81-87 are dependent on claim 80 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons claim 80 is allowable. In addition, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by Saliba.

For example, claims 82 and 86 recite features similar to claims 74 and 78. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claims 74 and 78, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 82 and 86 are respectfully requested.

As to claims 88-112, the Office Action states that these claims are similar to claims 72-87 “with the additional feature of establishing an on-line chat session with the user.” The Office Action further states that it would have been obvious “to recognize that such on-line chat session with the user is well know in the art such as the Instant Message chat offered by AOL” (Office Action – pages 3-4). The applicants respectfully disagree.

Initially, the applicants note that claim 88 recites a method in a user support system for providing support to a user accessing a web site. The method includes receiving information associated with the user, the information comprising at least one of the user’s name, the user’s telephone number, an Internet protocol address associated with the user, or a uniform resource locator representing a web page. The method also

includes accessing a web page based on the received information and establishing a communications link with the user.

Saliba, as discussed above, is not directed to providing user support services. More particularly, Saliba does not disclose or suggest receiving information associated with the user, where the information comprises at least one of the user's name, the user's telephone number, an Internet protocol address associated with the user, or a uniform resource locator representing a web page. Saliba also does not disclose or suggest accessing a web page based on the received information.

For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 88 are respectfully requested.

Claims 89-98 are dependent on claim 88 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons claim 88 is allowable. In addition, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by Saliba.

For example, claim 92 recites that the method further comprises passing events performed on the user support system to the user via the communications link to enable the user to view a same web page as that being displayed by the user support system. This feature has not been addressed in the Office Action. Therefore, a prima facie case under 35 U.S.C. § 103 has not been established. The applicants respectfully request that any subsequent communication address the features of claim 92 or withdraw the rejection.

In any event, Saliba does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 92. For at least this additional reason, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 92 are respectfully requested.

Claim 98 recites that the method further includes establishing an on-line chat session with the user. The Office Action admits that Saliba does not disclose this feature, but states that it would have been obvious to incorporate this feature in Saliba (Office Action – page 3). The Office Action, however, does not provide adequate motivation under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as to why it would have been obvious to include such a feature in Saliba. For example, the Office Action merely states that on-line chat sessions with the user are well known in the art, such as the Instant Message chat offered by AOL (Office Action – pages 3-4). Initially, the Office Action has not provided evidence showing that Instant Messaging systems, such as the one offered by AOL, existed at the time of the applicants' invention. In addition, the applicants note that claim 98 does not recite on-line chat sessions in general, but the use of an on-line chat session within a method associated with a user support system. The applicants assert that use of an on-line chat session in the claimed environment is not well known and request that any subsequent communication provide a reference that discloses the use of an on-line chat session in the environment recited in claim 98 or withdraw the rejection. The applicants further note that no portion of Saliba is pointed to as providing objective motivation for modifying Saliba to include such a feature. Therefore, the motivation to modify Saliba to include such a feature does not satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

For at least these additional reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 98 are respectfully requested.

Claim 99 recites a system for providing support to a user accessing a web site, comprising at least one processing device configured to receive information associated with the user, where the information identifies the web site that the user was accessing

when a request for user support was made. Similar to the discussion above with respect to claim 72, Saliba is not directed to a system for providing support to a user accessing a web site and does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 99.

For example, Saliba does not disclose or suggest at least one processing device configured to receive information associated with the user, the information identifying the web site that the user was accessing when a request for user support was made. Saliba further does not disclose or suggest accessing the web site based on the received information, as also recited in claim 99.

For at least these reasons, Saliba does not disclose or suggest each of the features of claim 99. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 99 are respectfully requested.

Claims 100-110 are dependent on claim 99 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons claim 99 is allowable. In addition, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by Saliba.

For example, claims 103 and 109 recite features similar to claims 92 and 98. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claims 92 and 98, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 103 and 109 are respectfully requested.


Claim 112 recites features similar to claim 88. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 88, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 112 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 13-2491 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: 
Glenn Snyder
Registration No. 41,428

Date: December 9, 2004

11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800